

Remarks/Arguments

In the Non-Final Office Action dated September 16, 2011, it is noted that claims 5-12 are pending and stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claims 1-4 were previously canceled. Claims 5 and 9 are independent claims in this application.

No claims are amended in the present response.

Cited Art

The following references have been cited and applied in the present Office Action: U.S. Patent No. 6,829,487 to Eiden (hereinafter "Eiden"), U.S. Patent No. 7,058,719 to Motoyama (hereinafter "Motoyama").

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Eiden in view of Motoyama.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claim 5 recites:

A method for inserting a new device in a community of devices comprising:

selecting, by a user, a user chosen device from one of the community of devices for authorizing insertion of a new device into the community;

storing, by each device of the community which receives an insertion request from a new device, the insertion request in a memory of said each device;

forwarding, by each device of the community which receives a request from the user chosen device, the at least one stored insertion request to said user chosen device; and

performing, by the user chosen device, at least one user action for authorizing the insertion of the new device into the community.

Emphasis added.

The Office Action on page 4 concedes that Eiden does not disclose selecting a user chosen device, selecting, by a user, a user chosen device from one of the community of devices for authorizing insertion of a new device into the community; performing, by the user chosen device, at least one user action for authorizing the

insertion of the new device into the community.

In order to cure these admitted deficiencies of Eiden with respect to the specific interpretation of claim 5, the Office relies on Motoyama, figs. 14 and 16; col. 16, lines 45-51 and col. 17, lines 47-67. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The cited portions of Motoyama apparently refer to the control device 800, which allegedly may be used as a portable device for providing a uniform interface for manual control on the wireless LAN. (Motoyama, col. 13, lines 1-3 and col. 16, lines 32-34). However, Motoyama's control device 800 is not a user chosen device from one of the community of devices, as defined in claim 5.

In contrast to claim 5, Motoyama's control device 800 is a pre-determined control device. For example, the control device 800 is described as a lightweight handheld device similar to a remote control for a television. (Motoyama, col. 13, lines 13-14). In other words, such a remote control type of device is the pre-defined controller for the wireless LAN.

Furthermore, Motoyama does not appear to suggest that there is a plurality of control devices for the user to select from. Instead, Motoyama seems to teach that there is only one control device 800 for controlling the LAN. Therefore, Motoyama does not suggest a community of control devices. In other words, in Motoyama, the user does not appear to have a community of control devices to choose from. As such, Motoyama does not teach or suggest a user chosen device from one of the community of devices, as required in claim 5.

In addition, since Motoyama does not teach or suggest a user chosen device from one of the community of devices, Motoyama cannot teach the features of performing, by the user chosen device, at least one user action for authorizing the insertion of the new device into the community.

For the reasons noted above, Motoyama does not cure the admitted deficiencies of Eiden with respect to claim 5. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 is patentable over the combination of Eiden and Motoyama and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Independent claim 9 is different from claim 5 and must be interpreted according to its specific recited features of claim 9. For example, claim 9 includes the features of:

“a network interface for sending the at least one insertion request stored in said first memory upon request from a device chosen by a user of the community for performing at least one user action for authorizing the insertion of the new device in the community.” Emphasis added.

Although claims 5 and 9 are different and must be interpreted on their own merit, Applicant applies the above arguments for claim 5 regarding a device chosen by a user to the specific interpretation of claim 9. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable over the combination of Eiden and Motoyama, and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Dependent claims 6-8 and 10-12 depend from and incorporate all the features of an allowable independent parent claim. Furthermore, each dependent claim includes additional distinguishing features. For claims 6-8 and 10-12, Applicant applies the above arguments from claim 5 to the specific interpretation of each respective dependent claim. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 6-8 and 10-12 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable parent claim. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-8 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment, reconsideration of the application, and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse Non-Final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the Applicant's attorney, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

No fees are believed due with regard to this Amendment. However, if there is a fee, please charge the fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **07-0832**.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Hay Yeung Cheung/
Hay Yeung Cheung
Myers Wolin LLC
Registration No.: 56,666
973-401-7157

CUSTOMER NUMBER **72109**
Myers Wolin, LLC
Telephone: (973) 401-7157